DEPARTMENT ON CHURCH AND SOCIETY
DIVISION OF STUDIES - WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

ARCHIVES

project papers

On the Common Christian Responsibility Toward Areas of Rapid Social Change

Papers in this series are circulated for private use only and may not by republished

October 1957. No.11

THE WEST AND THE AREAS OF RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE

by

Theodor Steltzer

Dr. Theodor Steltzer is a former Minister President in Germany. His address was presented to the German Council of the European Movement in September 1956.

Project papers are intended primarily for the use of consultants and study groups working on these topics. They are issued for information and as a basis of discussion. Comments and additional material on the subject matter of these papers are solicited.

17, route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland

PROJECT PAPERS PREVIOUSLY ISSUED

No. 1 The Characteristics of Urban Centres in the East - April, 1956

by Dr. J.H.A. Logemann

No. 2 India's Quest for Democracy - April, 1956

by P.D. Devanandan, M.M. Thomas and others

No. 3 Europe and the Underdeveloped Countries - May, 1956

By André Philip

No. 4 Notes on Problems of Urbanisation and Industrialisation in Indonesia - May, 1956

by Dr. H. Baas

No. 5 Formation of Modern Japan and Christianity - July, 1956
(Kindai Nippon-No Keisei-To Kirisutokyo)

by Prof. Mikio Sumiya

No. 6 The Peoples of Asia and their encounter with Technical Civilisation - August, 1956

by Prof. D. Gerhard Rosenkranz

No. 7 Report on a Social Survey of Sekondi-Takoradi - September, 1956

by Prof. K.A. Busia, M.A., D.Phil.(Oxon)

No. 8 The Pattern of Rural Community Development in India - January, 1957

by M.M. Thomas

No. 9 The International Class Struggle - June, 1957

by Reinhold Niebuhr

No. 10 Africa in Transition - A Social Anthropological Observation - September 1957

by Prof. K.A. Busia, M.A., D.Phil.(Oxon)

Copies of these issues may be secured from

World Council of Churches
17 route de Malagnou
Geneva - Switzerland

THE WEST AND THE AREAS OF RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE.

By

Theodor Steltzer.

I should like to tackle this subject in its spiritual and human aspect, and must therefore try to assess the tasks with which the existence of under-developed countries and under-nourished people confronts humanity.

I do this on the assumption that the spiritual aspect is of fundamental importance in any political, legal, economic or technical considerations. It is true, this seems contrary to the general tendency to treat spiritual forces, and the criteria determined by them, like Cinderella, because these forces are disturbing. But the events of the 20th century have made it clear to all thinking people that without such spiritual norms they are simply lost in the dark. That is why the power of the spirit is being discovered afresh. Everything is tending to converge on man as a creative personality, on a new universality in our outlook, on spiritual unity in this pluralistic world.

A New Era: Need for Basic Reorientation of Man's Outlook.

This situation means that we must re-shape and widen our forms of thought. Niels Bohr, the Danish atomic scientist, has drawn attention to this many times. Our dialectic way of thinking has led us to an impasse of contradictions. Undoubtedly we live in many polar relationships such as: the individual and society; freedom and necessity; faith and knowledge; heaven and earth. And these contradictions cannot be overcome unless a third element is introduced - otherwise the tensions are bound to lead to shortcircuits and to false alternatives which divide people's opinions instead of guiding them to their common root. Niels Bohr shows how thinking with integrity enables us to adjust the differences and to see them in a wider perspective. He also shows how an "integral" mode of thought of this kind can be developed into a method of study which enables us to take account of the complications and oppositions of the actual world in a constructive way. We do not have to decide between the individual and society, the individual or the collective, necessity or freedom, West or East, one group or another. On the contrary, in the meantime we have learnt that no practical solution can be reached on this basis. In all our discussions about spiritual, political, economic or social questions we must therefore first find a common basis, a single, common point of departure, if we want to find a just solution amidst the complexity of the problems involved. Our dialectic way of thought must be broadened out into an approach that is universal, complete and all-embracing.

Arnold Bergstraesser has pointed out that, already a generation ago, Ernst Troeltsch and Max Scheler had made a philosophical analysis of civilisation; they said the world was passing through a phase in which the historic civilisations were being synthesised and balanced. They took as their starting point the creative cultural forces in our own period of history and foresaw that the development of modern communications would make it impossible for the old historic civilisations to remain in isolation. The mere fact that the different orders knew about one another and

about the spirit that impelled them was bound eventually to influence the foundations on which those cultures were built, and make us realise that they must be adjusted to each other on a common foundation, if conflict between them were to be avoided.

The same applies to the development which has taken place in the relation between the sociological groups. The associations and groups have had bitter quarrels in the social sphere and regarded one another with hostility; each has built up its own ideology based on its own real or assumed interests. Since then these groups have become dependent on one another, both in their interests and in their ideology through the practical process of discussion, so that they have to recognise one another's right to existence. Today no single group can promote its own interests through political power. If the conflict were continued with external methods of oppression, the inevitable result would be growing disintegration. All those involved must therefore realise that the way to co-operation can only be found through shared responsibility, and that the threat of disintegration can thus be avoided.

Lastly, this situation is repeated in the sphere of international politics. Until the first world war the predominant factor was the struggle to maintain the balance of power in Europe. The fine art of diplomacy consisted in struggling for national interests and at the same time keeping military forces in readiness, in order to enforce the final decision by war, if necessary. The result was two world wars, and these wars have destroyed the balance of power in Europe. In the meantime new nations have appeared in world politics, which have a just claim to share the responsibilities and to be liberated from oppressive social conditions. At the same time world economic problems have become so interdependent (I need only recall the growing differentiation in the production of modern energy and the way it is applied) that a constructive solution of the European problems confronting us can only be found within the framework of a common world policy. Here also we therefore need a new basis for political co-operation. What is required is a policy of partnership between independent nations with equal rights, if the disquieting process of disintegration is to be stopped.

I have tried to trace out a pattern of thought which would enable world politics to develop so as to bring about a new balance between the nations that would help to promote peace. We need to have some conception of the future. Many things today are going wrong merely because there is no common basis upon which the different interests and spheres can be adjusted. But it is absolutely essential to consider all the problems together and fit them on to a common basis, because none of them can be solved in isolation.

This concept of the future, of which I have spoken, of course does not provide us with a blue-print for international policy, but it enables us to see things in perspective, and to decide which is the more important. I should like to try to make this clear by giving a few examples.

Rethinking the Priorities in International Relations.

Foreign policy in the past gave priority to the protection of national life and of the interests of the sovereign state. The view was that in this policy war had to be resorted to as the "ultima ratio" in order to enforce a political decision. Predominance was therefore given to military strength and to the formation of coalitions and alliances, so as to be on the stronger side in the event of war. "War is the pursuance of politics by different methods", was the slogan; or "Si vis pacem, pare bellum". This line of thought is no longer possible. A third world war would be tne end of all politics. Practical arguments may still be found to support the armament policy of the past and the conception of military strength as a central political task - although such arguments cannot excuse the governments of that time for not making greater endeavours to secure a constructive peace. Now a new situation has arisen, because wars can no longer be expected to provide any solutions, and because peace is the decisive factor on which depends the solution of all our political, economic and technical problems. Even if it proved possible to confine the war within certain limits, by means of security pacts, this would not prevent the real evil - the disintegration in the world. Peace is essentially more than the absence of war. One of the first tasks of foreign politics must therefore be to create conditions which make it possible to maintain peace. For this we need political aims which reconcile the vital interests of the West with the legitimate claims of the East. A future policy of this kind is the only possibility of cooperating in improving the political climate in the West and preparing the way for a new international policy. Otherwise we are heading for a new atomic armaments race, in which we are more or less passive; at the most we might exercise satellite functions such as protection by means of radar warnings, warding off surprise attacks from the air, and ensuring local defence, while the disintegration of the forces of society continued in the world.

Maintaining a balance between the strength of the two main atomic powers certainly does not provide any guarantee for world peace. But a common political conception would considerably reduce the danger of war.

Hitherto we have tended too much to regard the problem of foreign politics exclusively as a conflict between Washington and Moscow. Here, too, the idea of security has led us to a dangerous alternative, in which we regard everything as either black or white; we have only done so once before in the past, in the case of Hitler, and also to a lesser extent in the case of the Allies. The rise of the Asian peoples, who will not fit into any power-system, has considerably changed the situation. No one can deny that India has become a factor in international politics and that Nehru's voice carries considerable weight. If one reads carefully the speech which he made at the German Association for Foreign Policy one will recognise that with him one could easily reach a common conception of an international political purpose, even if one did not agree on every detail. It would at any rate be a beginning, in breaking down the dangerous political ideologies which at present take the form of insoluble antitheses and power-blocs. We must recognise that outside the sphere of

power-politics there are forces and achievements which are of political importance, even if power-politics have no relation to them. But as long as we place the military aspects in the foreground this will not be possible and will only give the Soviet Union a chance of exploiting the situation politically, while we waste time in a passivity based on fear and defeatism. The only thing which can restore the lost self-confidence of the West and open up fresh opportunities for political discussion is a political conception, and in this we need have no fear of Russia.

Of course, the problem of security remains a very real one. But there is a difference between giving priority to this problem or to the creation of practical bases for peace, and making disarmament or rearmament our real aim. I cannot go into strategic questions. One must admit that they are not absolutely clear. It therefore behoves us to exercise reserve. On the other hand military plans must be coordinated with the political, strategic and technical requirements of the present time, and the history of warfare shows that these are constantly changing. This demands an open mind towards this process of development and not a rigid clinging to plans based on ideas which are out-of-date. Defence and security pacts are not political conceptions but means of ensuring security (it is to be hoped only temporary ones) during a period of transition. NATO also is only a transitional form of organisation, although it is still important for us at the present time and we feel gravely concerned if it is undermined. All the same it would be a mistake to regard Nato defence as the sole hope for the future. This would only leave the field free to the Kremlin for its political manoeuvres. Arrangements for security should serve only as a means of military protection, for averting aggression. It would be disastrous to apply military oppression of the old style as a political instrument.

The Suez Canal crisis is a typical example of the way in which crises become more acute if false importance is attached to military considerations. These are not questions which could justify a war. The freedom of passage in the Canal is a comparatively simple matter, on which it should easily be possible for those concerned to reach an agreement. On the question of nationalisation neither side has a firm moral position. It was to be foreseen that the attempt at military pressure would evoke susceptibilities in the former colonial territories and involve the danger of the moral isolation of the West. On the other hand the problem must not be simplified, as if the liquidation of British influence in the Middle East were merely a question of eradicating the last traces of colonialism. The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire provides us with a parallel, which we should take as a warning. It did not result in peace but in the splitting-up of Europe. There is a danger that the countries now liberated from British imperialism will not become free either, but mere pawns in the hands of the two great powers. Eden's mistake consists not only in rattling the sabre at the wrong moment, but also in having no plan for settling affairs in the Middle East. The Middle East is of the greatest importance for the whole of Europe. But England, and to a certain extent France also, seem to think that they do not really need Europe. That is presumably the reason why Eden completely ignored the Council of Europe and the West European Union, when he took the initial steps in Egypt, and made no attempt to work out a Near Eastern policy with the rest of Europe. It is a very disquieting fact that he has not yet perceived the need for a European policy for the Middle East, and this

can only grow out of closer co-operation between the countries of Europe. For a Europe divided as it is today, which has arrived too late in the application of atomic energy, which is dependent on the U.S.A., which is now in danger of losing its direct access to oil, and whose supply of coal is becoming more and more of a social problem, is in danger during the next few decades of becoming an under-developed territory itself. That is why the union of Europe is one of the most important essentials for a new balance in international affairs. But this means that Europe itself must be consolidated politically, economically and socially. If we cling too long to obsolete conceptions we shall not achieve this inner consolidation in time. We shall then be in danger of being carried along in a historical development over which we have no control, in which the form of the new world is determined solely by the non-European nations.

From what has been said above we perceive the tasks with which politics confront industry, and with which industry confronts politics. The central problem for international politics and international economics is to control the vast social revolution in which we find ourselves. Half of the people living in the world today are under-nourished. 80% of these people (about one milliard in all) cannot read or write. More than 300 million of them suffer all their lives from preventable diseases like malaria, dysentery, trachoma, small-pox, etc. On the average the food they get is 25% less than their health requires. Their average income for a whole year is not enough to buy a suit of clothes in a Western European country.

The Political Task of the West.

This rough outline, which shows the incredible number of our fellow-men living in poverty, confronts us with great political tasks today. Justice demands that this poverty be abolished. The coloured peoples can justly claim that the standard of life of the civilised countries must not be maintained at their expense. Political wisdom also demands such a social balance, because the present conditions present a fruitful soil for exaggerated political forms which increase the unrest and disorder in the world. And finally it is an economic necessity. For the West cannot live without the productive forces of the East, and therefore has a vital interest in helping to establish healthy social conditions. It was to the credit of Harry Truman that he was the first to tackle this problem politically in his Declaration of January 20th, 1949, in Point 4 of his Four-Point Programme. His basic ideas have been adopted by the UNO, UNESCO, the International Bank and other bodies. In the meantime many experiences have been made, some positive, others negative, which clearly show that these tasks (which are rendered even more difficult owing to the increase in population) cannot be solved by the present methods. It is clear that they are gigantic tasks which cannot be coped with all in a moment, but which require a long-range programme. On the other hand the forces of production must be increased sufficiently to raise the individual's standard of life gradually, and not be consumed by the growth in population. That involves difficult and systematic preliminary study. It is true, a good deal of study is already being devoted to the question, e.g. by the Economic and Social Council of the UNO, by the Colombo Plan and by plans for developing individual countries and regions. But a whole host of important questions still remain unanswered. I have in mind the order of priority in the social task as a whole, the possibilities of improving nutrition on a world basis, increasing

the sources of energy, international planning in the sphere of engineering and technics, the necessities of technical finance, the prevention of soil exhaustion and the formation of deserts, the tasks in the field of cultural and technical education, and the repercussions of these plans on the present economic situation. At the present stage we already need to concentrate and coordinate our ideas. The organisation best suited to do this would be the UNO, which would have to form a separate institution for the purpose of enquiring into the possibility of development on a world scale, taking due account of every aspect of the question. We too should devote intensive though to these questions, which I can only indicate here. Today I should only like to emphasise one point of view which arises from my general remarks. The necessity for international cooperation in the future makes it essential for us to aim at political methods which enable us to avoid the application of economic pressure for political decisions, just as much as the use of military measures. The question of the second Assuan Dam, which started the political crisis about the Suez Canal, would probably have played a less disastrous role if this principle had been followed. It is a question of life and death for Egypt to utilise the water in the tributaries of the Nile to the best economic advantage, because the country simply must increase its productivity in order to support the growing population and raise their standard of life. This is a genuine problem of an economically under-developed region, the solution of which is of international concern. But Egypt is not the sole country involved; the question also affects the Sudan, Abyssinia, Belgian Uranda-Urungi, Uganda, the South of Kenya and Tanganyika. In accordance with what I have said above, one must take the water-economy of this whole region as a starting-point and examine the technical possibilities. This has been done. From the aspect of technical engineering it is considered possible to arrive at a satisfactory solution within ten years. Of course, more funds would need to be invested than in the present project. If this problem is restricted to Egyptian territory and bound up with political views the result may be not only that Nasser tries to bring about an inadequate solution (out of national pride) but also that the other regions take matters into their own hands, thus starting a general struggle for the tributaries of the Nile. An effort should be made to re-examine the whole problem as a purely economic-technical question from a practical standpoint.

The Spiritual Problem of Industrialization.

So far I have only dealt with some aspects of the question before us, aspects which are comparatively simple, because they concern matters which can be rationally understood and technically controlled. But there are also other aspects which involve much greater difficulties. Modern industrial development is not only an economic and technical process; it also transforms thought and social life and its destructive repercussions must be prevented. The point of departure is very different in the different countries of Asia, Africa and South America, and this already makes cooperation more difficult. Still greater difficulties arise from the fact that the West has not found the way to the confidence of the Eastern peoples. We must start on an entirely new basis, if we are to gain their confidence. Unfortunately Europeans lack the ability, or the imagination, to realise that the attempt to develop the world included a spiritual problem, which could not be understood or solved by European standards. It is not sufficient to provide the under-developed countries with some of the benefits of civilisation. Even the most primitive countries have laws, ways of life and transcendental ties

which must not be destroyed, without giving them a share in a new order. But that has not been done.

> "Having taken away their way of life we then made it impossible for them to acquire any other. Having supplanted their law by ours we then gave them no right to live as our law demanded but rather forced them to drift suspended in dark acceptance of a state of non-being. That is something that no human race can do and survive".
>
> (Laurens van der Post)

The above book by Laurens van der Post, "The Dark Eye in Africa", is very illuminating concerning this state of mind. Van der Post comes from a Dutch family which emigrated to South Africa over 300 years ago. He describes the Europeans' lack of understanding for the primitive peoples and for their orders and ways of life, and the disastrous effects, including those on economic conditions. He says on this point:

> "Even the soil of Africa, this ancient red soil founded on the original rock of the earth, is rebelling against European methods of agriculture and is carrying on a kind of continual "Mau-Mau" against the white man's crops and cattle in Africa. The soil will co-operate no longer and is either blown away in clouds of dust under the burning sun, or, during the rains, fills the rivers till they run red with blood to the sea or else bubble like porridge in the steaming marshes. The desert too is advancing on Cape Town at the rate of almost a mile a year, and the white man's expensive and rare European cattle grow sterile and feeble and are reduced to half their former size within a few short cattle generations in tropical Africa. The law of diminishing returns in imported animal husbandry and agriculture in Africa has already set in. Those wise Europeans who have studied Africa closely have read a warning lesson in what has happened to the cattle and goods they brought with them from Europe and to-day are turning to the despised African's humped beasts in order to rejuvenate their own European animals and redress the mounting negative balances in their banks. Some of the wisest of them have even rejected their European stock and bred this despised indigenous material with the same care and skill that their forefathers used on the indigenous breeds of Europe, and as a result have been so rewarded by the response of Africa that they have grown rich in the process. But elsewhere the revolt in Africa is all of a piece; the reaction of indigenous soil and indigenous man to the white man's attempt to deny Africa and her children their own unique being is one and complete."

Van der Post goes still deeper when he describes the dilemma which, in his view, confronts not only Africa but the whole world. He says:

> "The whole problem of modern culture expresses the need for some transcendent factor or purpose wherein neither white nor black, neither natural nor thinking man, will have to be sacrificed to one another but instead both will be joined and made complete in one transcending purpose..... I want to suggest that the unrest in Africa, in all its facets, European, cosmic, global and African, is plainly an extension of our own individual unrest..... Modern man with his grievous and

> crippling realisation of having lost the sense of his own beginnings, with this agonising feeling of great and growing estrangement from nature, finds that life holds up Africa like a magic mirror miraculously preserved before his darkening eyes. In this great glass of time the inmost reflections of his ancient, timeless spirit stare out at him, and he can, could he but realise it, rediscover there his despised and rejected natural self, recognising before it is too late the full horror of his stubborn rejection of it."

Lastly I should like to draw attention to a book by Tempel, the Belgian Franciscan Father, about Bantu philosophy, in which he points out the great dangers which arise if one restricts oneself to admitting gifted members of non-industrialised countries into Western colleges. He writes:

> "It would be a real outrage to humanity, which the colonisers would be perpetrating, if they were to deprive the primitive peoples of the moral values and of the essential truths bound up with their honourable old philosophy and with their ancient ideals - values which are a part of their very life. Uncivilised people are still extraordinarily conscious of their human rights. Under the pretext of "civilising" people, one runs the danger of killing "the human being" and increasing the number of uprooted people. The result is deplorable. If we white people want to give the Bantus anything, then we must give our gift a form which is adapted to their way of thought. It has been proved more than convincingly, that our economic civilisation is incapable of making Bantus into civilised people"!

The World Perspective in Which our Problems Must be Seen.

When you read what I have said so far you may say, "These are demands which are bound to founder when they come up against the reality of modern man". But I fear that such scepticism shows a premature resignation and does not correspond either to the situation or to the feeling of the peoples themselves. I have made it clear through concrete examples on different important planes that it is the situation ifself which forces me to revolutionise my way of thinking. This applies especially to the position in which we find ourselves in Germany.

But I should like to examine the serious objection, that man is no longer in a position to make independent decisions concerning the conflict of forces. If that were true, then there would be nothing left for modern man to do than to resign himself completely to events, merely trying to adapt himself to a dynamic development of opposing forces over which he had lost all control.

It must be admitted that at the present time the people in the West and in the East find themselves in a situation which prevents them from making clear decisions. But this state of things is not insuperable, if we examine the reasons which have led man to a false conception of himself and of his existence both in the West and in the East. It is true, the reasons are different in the West from those in the East. The civilised man of the West, owing to his exaggerated individualism and to the

massification of people in society has lost his sense of responsibility towards his fellow men and to the world, and has thereby to a large extent lost his capacity for human fellowship outside his immediate personal sphere. The over-emphasis which he lays on analytical thought has weakened the forces of his consciousness and limited his capacity to appraise spiritual, universal questions. His level of thought has sunk to a material, quantitative plane in which he gives first consideration to organisations and institutions, to means, not ends. His attempt to comprehend reality merely through analytical reason was therefore bound to fail. We have made the practical experience that the 19th century did not succeed in developing forms which could survive in the 20th century and which could claim validity because they were true to reality. Nevertheless it is difficult for us to free ourselves from the out-of-date bases of the 19th century and to realise that our conception of history and of the world is still narrow and limited.

The awakening of the Eastern nations should remind us that hitherto the West has never represented the whole world in its historical development; on the contrary, before the Roman Empire great Empires flourished in Asia, China and India with a highly-developed culture. That is why we must include the Eastern nations in our search for a new balance of political forces with a spiritual basis; we must realise that the basic conceptions of the past are already out-of-date because we are now for the first time confronted with the whole world. We Germans especially are still hovering between Bismarck's tradition of empire, and the concept of a new Europe. But the latter remains vague and unrealistic as long as we fail to realise that all our efforts for the integration of Europe are of little avail, unless they are carried out within the framework of a new balance of power in the world.

That applies also to the Western governments which are still clinging to their past traditions of national sovereignty and paying too little attention to the facts of the present and the demands of the future. The situation is not improved by the fact that the younger nations, in their desire to be modern, are now imitating the short-sighted concept of national sovereignty formerly held in the West. Those responsible always fail, if they cling too much to a past tradition, or have too limited a view of the present situation. Like every individual, political leaders must always live in a tension between past, present and future, if the right decisions are to be made at the right time. Here again, what I said at the beginning about the necessity of a balance between the polarities and border-situations is still true.

One of the important conditions for solving the problems of our time is a live perception of their world perspective. A second condition is that people must learn not merely to examine things intellectually but also qualitatively. And for this Eastern thought has a better basis than Western thought. But so far neither the West nor the East has succeeded in overcoming the antithesis between the spiritual and the actual on a higher plane in face of the modern structure of civilisation. Whereas the West has neglected spiritual matters in favour of a reality seen in terms of matter and quantity, the spirit of the East has remained closer to a way of thought which encompassed the whole of reality, because it has not

lost touch with the transcendental to the same extent as the West. But it has not found the way to the material and social reality, which is one of man's tasks to control. That is why Eastern man has also failed to see the whole picture. Faced by the dynamic energy of Europe, he has been unable to develop his own forms, but has remained in a state of acceptance, of passive suffering, which has made it impossible for him to retain his independence over a long period of history, and to bring order into his social conditions. He is only now waking up to this situation. The East now needs the help of the West to create healthy social conditions, on a sound economic basis. It is in its own interest for the West to provide this help, because it cannot solve its own problems without the Eastern countries. But the West needs the help of the East in order to transcend its intellectual way of thinking and rediscover how to see life as a whole; this is the only way in which forces of common understanding can be developed. The East is not open to purely intellectual analysis. It can only be approached in human terms. I hope that Albert Schweitzer's fear will not be realised: that the West has lost the capacity to do this. It is a question of life and death both for the West and for the East, to find a common basis in the human spirit. Without this the political, economic and technical tasks will prove insoluble. Many pronouncements have been made in the East which show that leading personalities there have recognised this situation. I quote here the first President of Indonesia, Sutan Sjarir, speaking on the East-West problem:

> "The West itself today is passing through a process of re-thinking and purification. There is a growing consciousness that the application of science and technics may have terrible consequences, if the moral standards are thereby destroyed. The chaotic situation between the world powers, with all that it involves, is due to people's spiritual insecurity and lack of moral resistance. The crucial task facing man today, both in the East and in the West, is to save himself from this abyss of destruction by trying to rediscover a firm foothold in the world and his own purpose in the cosmos. In this search he must be guided by the standards of truth, beauty and goodness, of which human dignity is composed. These universal values are by no means a monopoly of the West today, nor of the East; they are tasks confronting mankind as a whole, whether people think that they should obey the commandments of the Almighty or whether they regard themselves as the centre."

Thinking out this situation presents tremendous tasks to the human mind, because man has lost most of the supports which hitherto gave him a sense of security and a spiritual hold. The old static, restricted view of history has disappeared and has been replaced by a dynamic variety, which still baffles him. His intellect has found no solution; even his belief in the causality of historical events will not stand the test of reality. There are indeed minor laws governing certain spheres, which have to be observed. But the laws of history can never exonerate man from his responsibility for coordinating all these different spheres. That is man's creative task and his responsibility.

Responsibilities of the West.

I have deliberately devoted so much space to the spiritual aspect of the tasks before us, because it is of central importance in solving the political, economic and social problems. We must arrive at quite a different understanding of the spiritual, psychological and sociological conditions, and the particular reasons for them, in the countries with which we wish to cooperate as partners. That will be easier in countries with old cultures like India, Indonesia and the Arab peoples than in Africa. India at any rate has recognised the dangers of an industrial process that is simply grafted on to its own culture (especially for family life), and is trying to find ways of preserving its own values without renouncing modern progress altogether. It seems to me that there is a growing understanding for this aspect of the problem. The "Good Will Mission" which was sent to Asia by the Industrial Association expressly drew attention to the need for recognising the psychological factors in the countries where money is invested. At the International Congress for Social Work held at Munich in August 1956, it was unanimously agreed that the problem was to coordinate technical progress with responsibility towards people. A delegate from the Philippines stressed the fact that material progress and technical schools were not sufficient, unless the work were based on a human-moral training. A Swiss engineer considered it necessary to inform Western engineers and business people about the sociological structure of the countries where money was invested, and also to encourage their exports, so that economic and social planning could go hand in hand.

Finally I should like to say something about what we Germans could do, within the sphere of international and European development, to help solve these problems. In my remarks I was particularly anxious to make it clear that we must make big demands on ourselves if we want to be capable of cooperating with the new countries. At the present time we possess this capacity only to a small extent. We are still in a state of increasing disintegration. The present order is breaking up, and we have no conception of the nature of the future order for which we should aim. We can only achieve integration if we have definite aims in relation with which we can coordinate the different problems. And in my view, this future order can only be perceived in a world partnership of independent nations with equal rights. All our efforts must therefore be directed towards achieving this.

In this situation, opportunities for international cooperation are of special importance. Unfortunately this cooperation has to work in the midst of a disintegration which might be described as anarchical. Excellent experiences have been made with the international seminars of UNESCO, although at the beginning they were experiments in a completely unknown sphere. They have done much to establish contact between East and West and to make them realise their common tasks. Other bodies have set up similar seminars. They exchange their findings and thus help each other in their common task. But there is no inner connection between the many separate enterprises. The important point now, therefore, is to deepen this work so as to give it a sharper form within the framework of the common aims, bring it out of the experimental stage and give it a solid spiritual basis. As I have already said, we must learn to understand what lies behind the spiritual, political,

economic and cultural phenomena of the world. But at the same time we must understand our own situation better, so that we can bring our capacities to bear in the different spheres in which we cooperate with other countries. We must not stand still looking at the past, admiring our own achievements, pitying ourselves for the injustices we think we have suffered, or pursuing nationalistic aims; we must start with our common international tasks. For this we need clear emphases in order to help the special organisations for promoting international relations, exchange of views and cultural contacts to build solid foundations of knowledge and understanding. There is such chaos (both spiritual and organisational) in the bodies which are trying to study the trends in international affairs today, that the authorities financing them have lost their sense of direction too. Undoubtedly, in this field of study far more extensive funds are essential. We therefore need to coordinate all the efforts connected with Germany's tasks in international relations, apart from direct political affairs. Without such coordination it is impossible to see things as a whole, and this is essential if the work is to be tackled in the right way. This includes coordinating the research work on international relations, the question of European cooperation, the treatment of international questions in educational institutions, helping Germans to understand other countries, and vice versa, exchange of views, and cooperation on special cultural questions. I deliberately avoid using the word "cultural policy", because it might lead to misunderstanding, and give the impression that culture was being exploited for political purposes. This the national states must not do, in the interests of international cooperation, just as they must avoid exercising military or economic pressure. The indirect effects of cultural work which is entirely independent of politics will be greater, in the real sense.

For these reasons alone it is advisable for the whole question to be entrusted to bodies which are entirely non-political. This will also facilitate cooperation between experts, who are particularly suspicious of political influences since their experiences with the Third Reich. The tasks are so great that it is beyond the powers of a Ministry even to coordinate a long-range plan of study. And we need full-time experts, because officials with administrative posts naturally regard cooperation in cultural study as a side-line.

Consideration might therefore be given to the creation of a special non-official organisation on the lines of the British Council and the Svenska Institut, for coordinating the tasks outlined above. In addition to outstanding thinkers, it would include representatives of the Ministries. The British Council has an Executive Committee of 30 members, 9 of whom are representatives of official bodies. In 1956 its annual budget amounted to $2,779,700. An organisation of this kind would relieve the official cultural work tremendously, while maintaining constant contact with it.

A whole series of organisations already exist which are actively working on these problems, and which could form the kernel of a Council of this kind. The Council could be built up, using them as a basis. For coordination has become a burning necessity. As a first step, the non-official organisations in question should form a small committee, to

consider ways of cooperation and division of labour: for instance, the German National Commission of UNESCO for considering cultural problems on a world scale, the German Council of the European Movement for questions of European Cooperation, the Research Institute of the German Association for Foreign Policy for research in the sphere of international politics, the "Inter Nationes" Association, which quietly does much excellent work collecting information about other countries, etc. etc.

A Committee of this kind might be of the greatest importance, especially for our cooperation with the under-developed countries on cultural and educational questions. For cooperation requires careful preparation and consideration of widely differing aspects, before institutions can be set up. It would, of course, be very desirable if we could increase the number of suitable German experts, consultants and executives in the under-developed countries. But limits are imposed by our own tasks. We should therefore concentrate on training native teachers in those countries. For instance, the funds granted by the Bundestag for technical assistance would make it possible to train natives to teach in the trade and industrial schools in the under-developed countries, and their experience would be of value when setting up further training-colleges of this kind. But this would require thorough preparation, which should not be restricted to the technical side of the problem, but should be related to all its different aspects.

I have tried to describe the subject with all its broad implications, and from a balanced point of view. We tend to forget that even spiritual matters involve hard facts. I have therefore taken the liberty to examine these things from the spiritual aspect and unreservedly to give them the place that is due to them.